

REMARKS

This amendment is provided in response to the Office Action of Nov. 22, 2004. In view of the above amendments, and the following remarks, applicants respectfully request reconsideration of all grounds for objection in this matter.

The drawings have been amended. FIG. 3 has been replaced by FIG. 3A. FIG. 3B and FIG. 3C have been added.

Claims 1-9 and 11-19 remain in this application. Claims 10 and 20 have been amended.

In the specification, the paragraphs [0006], [0014], [0020], [0022] and [0028] have been amended. The new paragraphs [0014.1] and [0014.2] have been added. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added.

Correspondingly, the abstract has been amended for clarification and consistency.

The Objection To The Drawings Is Overcome

The Office Action objected drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) since it was said that the drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the ball bearing of claim 8, the roller bearing of claim 9, and the inclination of the handle or the pressing to obtain the inclination in either of claims 10 or 20 must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings, which includes FIG. 3A, FIG. 3B and FIG. 3C, replaces the original sheet including FIG. 3.

FIG. 3 has been replaced by FIG. 3A where a previously omitted element 22 has been added and a minor error in element 48 has been corrected.

FIG. 3B and FIG. 3C have been added to show features of claims previously omitted.

Attachment: One Replacement Sheet
 Two Annotated Sheets Showing Changes

claim(s). Applicants request reconsideration and withdraw of this objection since the corrected drawing sheets have been submitted. FIG. 3B and FIG. 3C have been added in this amendment. The feature of ball bearing of claim 8 is shown in FIG. 3B. The feature of roller bearing of claim 9 is shown in FIG. 3C.

The feature of the inclination of the handle or the pressing to obtain the inclination in either of claims 10 or 20 has been removed from claims.

The Objection To The Specification Is Overcome

The Office Action objected specification since it was said that the specification fail to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter under 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). And there appears to be no disclosure of a roller bearing in the specification for the roller bearing disclosed in claim 9. Applicants request reconsideration and withdraw of this objection since the specification has been amended. The amended specification discloses a structure of roller bearing in amended paragraph [0020].

The Objection To The Claims 10-20 Is Overcome

The Claim 10 was objected since it was said in (c), line 2, the second occurrence of “pin” should start with --a-- to provide proper antecedent basis. This informality has been corrected. The amended Claim 10 states: “(c) a pivot pin holder slidably attached along said arm, said pivot pin holder having a pin with a pointed end; (d).....”.

The Claims 10 and 20 were objected since it was said the claim language is confusing and this confusion also extends to specification. Specifically, the examiner is questioning if the inclination is caused by hand pressure forcing said inclination or if the bore in the elongated arm for the marking instrument has an incline or a feature to allow inclination. In fact, the applicants intended to express a meaning of "exerting an inclining force towards the center" but not the "inclination" or the "feature to allow inclination". The Claims 10 and 20 have been amended with the confusing languages been removed. The specification and the abstract have also been amended for clarification and consistency.

The references of Troll (US 487,800), Costovici (US 1,460,093), Benshimol (US 2,062,157), Brower (US 2,471,193), Lankford (US 2,512,235), Zern and Schwarzer (US 2,698,484), Moll (US 3,292,262), Glasgow (US 3,805,391), Prickett (US 3,815,246), Schiess (US 4,044,464), Perna (US 4,794,699), Hwang (US 5,040,299), Sirois (US 5,235,754), Landmark (US 5,253,421) and Nakamura (US 5,784,791) have been reviewed.

Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Appl. No. 10/707,951
Amdt. Dated Jan. 4, 2005
Reply to Office Action of Nov. 22, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

Kedu Han

Kehan Han

----- Applicants Pro Se -----

4714 Mason Court
Sugar Land
TX 77479
U.S.A.
Tel. (281) 313-4638
E-mail kedu@ieee.org

2005 Jan. 4



Kedu Han , Applicant

Attachments



FIG. 3 becomes FIG. 3A.




FIG. 3A

FIG. 3 becomes FIG. 3A.

FIG. 3B added




FIG. 3B

FIG. 3C added




FIG. 3C

Previously Omitted
hatch pattern added.